UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Economic Freedom: Morals and Marriage

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

American Notes

A Sunday in Northampton

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Banner of Peace

By NICHOLAS ROERICH

The Atheist Museum in Moscow

(From Our Special Correspondent)

By DOROTHY WALTON

VOLUME CV NUMBER 12

Chicago, May 19, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, • Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., • } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes

Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 179
Economic Freedom: Morals and Marriage—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 181
Jottings—J. H. H. 183
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—A Sunday in Northampton—SYDNEY STRONG ... 184
ARTICLES—
Parables of War and Peace—VII. It All Depends!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 183
The Atheist Museum in Moscow—DOROTHY WALTON 185
The Banner of Peace—NICHOLAS ROERICH 187
The W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Enforcement—T. RICHARD WITMER 188
POETRY—
A Sonnet Remembered When Gandhi Was Arrested—*Lord Byron* 179
THE STUDY TABLE—
Wall Street on Trial—ALFRED LIEF 189
Book Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 190
CORRESPONDENCE—
Justice in Canada—RABBI MAURICE N. EISENDRATH 190
Marriage and Economics—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 190
Needed, A New Conception of Deity—JOHN T. RICKETT 191
THE FIELD—
The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection 191
Three Years of Preparation for Chicago's Second Parliament of Religions—Fellowship of Faiths 191
Australian Amazed at Prohibition in United States 192

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV MONDAY, MAY 19, 1930 NUMBER 12

A SONNET REMEMBERED WHEN GANDHI WAS ARRESTED

Eternal Spirit of the chainless mind!
Brightest in dungeons, Liberty, thou art—
For there thy habitation is the heart—
The heart which love of thee alone can bind;
And when thy sons to fetters are consigned,
To fetters, and the damp vault's dayless gloom,
Their country conquers with their martyrdom,
And Freedom's fame finds wings on every wind.
Chillon! thy prison is a holy place,
And thy sad floor an altar, for 'twas trod,
Until his very steps have left a trace
Worn as if thy cold pavement were a sod,
By Bonnivard! May none these marks efface!
For they appeal from tyranny to God.

—Lord Byron.

In the New Testament we read of the arrest of Jesus of Nazareth in ancient Palestine by the troops of the Roman Empire which occupied the country as a conquered province. They "led him unto Pilate," runs the text,

"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation and forbidding to give taxes to Caesar."

In another place the story reads,

"And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place."

All this has a curiously modern sound as we read of what has been happening in India. On Sunday, May 4th—historic date!—Mahatma Gandhi was arrested by the soldiers of the British Empire which occupies his country today, as Rome occupied Jesus's country yesterday, as a conquered province. Against Gandhi is brought the same charge that was leveled against Jesus—that he is "perverting the nation," which means, of course, turning it against the rule of the alien oppressor. "Stirring up the people," "forbidding to give taxes"—how familiar these phrases sound, and how perfectly they fit as carried over from the Christ yesterday to the Mahatma today! To be sure, the parallel is not perfect. Jesus was at least given the semblance of a trial, whereas Gandhi is held in prison without even so much as a hearing. Pilate showed a decent reluctance to punish a man whose nobility he seems instinctively to have recognized, whereas, Lord Irwin has no compunctions and does not even deign to look upon the heroic Indian whom he has seized and cast behind the bars. But it is the crucifixion episode all over again, and, if Gandhi dies, he will, like Jesus, rise again to vex the world forever.

"The peculiar force of the tragedy (in India) lies in the fact that the most civilized Empire of the West should have failed after a decade of opportunity to come to an understanding with a leader of Gandhi's supreme generosity and fairness." —New York *World.*

Lost opportunity is indeed the tragedy of India. With such a man as Gandhi exercising such control over the masses of the Indian people as no man in history has ever before exercised over any people, it needed but a little good spirit and a high degree of statesmanship on the part of Britain's leaders to settle the Indian question amicably and permanently. At any time in the last ten years cooperation with Gandhi instead of hostility against him would have brought about reconciliation and peace. Is it the irony and curse of empire that it cannot thus act? Twice at least in these ten years the door of hope has swung wide open. The first time was in 1919, when Gandhi, a loyal subject of the Empire, led his people in a glad and grateful expectation of reward for their fidelity during the Great War. Constitutional reforms had been promised. Any fulfillment of promises would have moved India to new loyalty; but these promises, instead of being fulfilled, were flouted by Lloyd-George, Liberal. The second opportunity came in 1924, when Gandhi, released from prison, retired from active political leadership, to take up the work of social and religious reform. Here was an unexampled chance to meet the Mahatma in his retirement, and unite with his movement of internal reform an imperial movement for improved political relationships. This chance was thrown away by Baldwin and Birkenhead, Tories. Last year came a third and in this case last opportunity to cooperate with Gandhi and thus avoid a catastrophe that may well wreck the Empire and shake the very foundations of the world. This opportunity was lost by MacDonald, Laborite. What difference does it seem to make, in the hour of great crises, whether we have Liberals, Tories, or Laborites in office?

Senator Robinson's return from the London Naval Conference was accompanied by his announcement that this country must spend at least $100,000,000 to establish parity with Great Britain as defined in the Treaty now before the Senate.

"It is portentous and a thing of state"

that a disarmament treaty should require naval build-

ing to the tune of $100,000,000 for the carrying out of its provisions. We can imagine no more accurate measure of the distance that separates the London agreement and our hopes of what this agreement was going to be, than this amazing fact. It is true, of course, that had there been conference and no treaty, America would in all probability have spent three and four times this hundred million total—which is like a woman's saving her husband a thousand dollars by spending four thousand instead of five thousand dollars for a fur coat she wasn't expected to buy at all! Yet, the situation being what it is, what is there to do but ratify the Treaty and call it a day's work? There is bitter disappointment in the document, as in the substitution of limitation for reduction. There is failure, as in the collapse of the five-power pact. There is despicable hypocrisy, as in the foolish pretension of restriction of submarine warfare. There is positive harm, as in the creation of a three-power pact as over against France and Italy. Yet there are elements of good in the agreement, too—and no harm commensurate with the harm which would be done if the Treaty should now be thrown out by the Senate! There is no wickedness and abomination here, as in the Versailles Treaty. There is only feebleness and futility, disappointment and disillusion. Best make the best of it, and press on to better things! So, without enthusiasm, with no self-deception or empty optimism, certainly with commiseration for a commission which failed in its task, we say with Senator Borah—ratify the London Treaty and have done with it!

It may be doubted, however, if we can "have done with" the London Treaty, or any treaty, or any problem of European and world peace, till we have come to some kind of an understanding with France and Italy. These two selfish, militaristic, autocratic, blustering nations were the ones which wrecked the real hopes of the Naval Conference. They are the nations which now have it in their power to wreck even such meagre measure of accomplishment as the Conference actually achieved, and are apparently ready, if recent reports of shipbuilding are trustworthy, to do precisely this disastrous thing. They are the nations, France and Italy, which persistently, since the end of the Great War, have bedeviled Europe with turmoil by maintaining conditions and seeking ends in their own interest which must sooner or later bring about another war. Hating and fearing one another, and themselves spoiling for a fight, they yet manage to work together perfectly to defeat every fairer hope of a quiet Europe and a peaceful world. And where do they get their power, these two nations which suffered so terribly in the War, to work the mischief which they have done during the past decade? Partly from the forbearance of England, primarily from the forbearance of the United States, in canceling in large measure the war debts which under every condition of law and justice France and Italy should pay to honest debtors. Personally, we know of no more scandalous international spectacle than these two nations deliberately "welshing" on their debts, and then deliberately using the money thus gained to maintain huge armaments on land and sea, and thus destroy every hope of peace and brotherhood. A distinguished English publicist stated the other day that it was time England recognized that she was never going to get anywhere in her peace efforts until she read the riot act against France and used the whole power of the League of Nations to tame this recalcitrant nation to some degree of order. The same thing holds true of this country in relation to both France and Italy. Is it not time that we used our power as creditor to exact good behavior as a condition of any further temporizing on the debts?

It takes an outsider to get an objective point of view. Only the man who has no interest to serve, no prejudice to flatter and sustain, can see things precisely as they are. In the midst of the awful hullabaloo over Prohibition, an English newspaper man, the New York correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian*, wrote to his newspaper a concise yet comprehensive survey of the "wet" and "dry" situation in this country. This survey has enormous interest and importance. The reporter starts off by discounting what the advocates of both sides are so furiously saying these days. He rejects scornfully the statistics elaborately quoted by controversialists *pro* and *con*. He shows his essential sanity by suggesting that neither prosperity on the one hand nor the increase of crime upon the other hand, is attributable to Prohibition. He points out that smuggling liquor has practically ceased, and avers that this factor of the situation is "no longer of importance" as the country is now "making its own." Then comes the statement which the Boston *Transcript* calls "our British friend's grand slam"—that *"Prohibition is now 75 to 80 per cent effective,"* and that by spending a few millions more a year, *it can be made 85 to 90 per cent effective,* which is "as far as the authorities hope to go in this generation." It is evident that this cool-headed and impartial observer is not confused by the wild clamor of the winter's "wet" campaign. On the contrary, trained to observe and report amid conditions of whatever excitement the exact truth, this distinguished correspondent of the most trusted newspaper in the world finds himself in precise agreement with President Hoover, Attorney General Mitchell and Chairman Wickersham that enforcement is steadily improving and is largely effective today. Let the "wets" shout their heads off. Let them hire their $25,000 a year agitators and spend their millions in lying propaganda. Let our dripping

press lend itself to the disreputable business of trying to resurrect the dead and buried liquor traffic. Facts still remain facts. Prohibition is here to stay. America is going to win this battle as it has won other battles against evil!

We recently received a copy of the new edition of the pamphlet, "Pardon Tom Mooney—Innocent." We commented upon the publication of the original edition of this appeal for justice on behalf of Mooney and Billings, and find no reason to retract or revise our judgment that it constituted one of the most formidable documents we have ever seen. That a new edition should be required, that there should have been an interval of time in which such an edition could be prepared, is a disgrace to the state of California, as well as to America and the American people. Think of it! Here is Tom Mooney proved innocent of the crime for which he was convicted on perjured testimony. Here he has been in prison for fourteen long years (1916-1930) in expiation for an offense which it is now known he never committed. And not yet has the Governor of California done anything more than hem and haw, and palter and falter, and at last pass the buck to his parole board which has suddenly become stricken with paralysis, or worse. Is there a recall law in California? If so, why is it not invoked to recall this cowardly or indifferent official, and to put in his place a man who can do justice? If not, why is not the state alive with indignation against an executive who has not the sensitiveness nor courage to free the commonwealth from the reproach now resting upon it? Search the annals of what Robert Burns called "man's inhumanity to man," and where can you find in all the story from Socrates to Sacco and Vanzetti—and not forgetting Dreyfus!—anything worse than this? Nothing can remove the stain, even in part, except the pardon of Mooney and Billings. But how long are these men going to be able to keep alive to receive such pardon? There is such a thing as being too late. And if we can imagine anything worse than what has been done to these men during their lives, it is atonement coming to them after they are dead.

Economic Freedom: Morals and Marriage

Whatever may have been fundamental in the marriage ideal of the past, it is true that from now on we must recognize that it is the association of two self respecting and mutually respecting persons. It is folly to expect that a woman, an intelligent educated woman, will consent to any ideal of marriage that does not recognize her as she recognizes herself, a self determining personality.

But this changed status of woman could not have occurred unless woman had attained economic freedom. If there were no other career open to woman than that of marriage, she would be in fact subordinate to man. There would be no more escape in the modern industrial world than in an agricultural age. I doubt even if there were a great surplus of men, so that there would be active competition for women as wives that it would improve very much the status of women.

I do not mean to say that the education of women has not been a great factor in this change. The industrial revolution, the release of women from work in the home has given them the opportunity for acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge and economic opportunity have united to give the modern woman the vantage ground she now possesses. The fact that there are other careers open to women other than that of housewife is one of the most important factors in our modern life.

To be a wife and mother may be the highest ambition of every woman. But nevertheless it is true that many women have found a rich full life outside of marriage. And no intelligent mother can say to her daughter today, "But, my dear, what else can you do?" The truth is a girl today knows that in order to live she is not compelled to marry. Life affords for women, and we are thankful for it, more than a choice between marriage and a life as a dependent. There are more opportunities than that of a governess or seamstress open to her today.

The shadow of the old order still is cast over us. We refuse to give a woman in many cases equal pay with men even when they perform identical tasks. But the fact remains that where yesterday there was one opening for women today there are thousands. Women are found in almost every occupation once considered the sole prerogative of men. The American girl for the most part expects on graduation from school or college to earn her own living. She prepares herself as does her brother for some useful work in the world.

One hundred years ago women married at the age which finds their great-granddaughters in school and college. And if not in school or college then they are in some form of industry in which they are earning their own living.

It is hard for us living in this process of transition to realize the tremendous change that has come in attitude toward some of the most fundamental features of our social order. We may not like it. We may protest against it. But the change is here, and we may as well make up our minds to face the facts of life.

Once marriage was considered as a life-long arrangement. It no longer is. Once divorce was almost unthinkable. Today it is a commonplace. We may regret it, but it is fact.

In the year 1924 in five large cities, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Denver and Cleveland the divorces approximately were fifty percent of the marriages. Once a woman had to face the prospect of divorce not only as bringing a social stigma but also as a situation in which the opportunities for obtaining a livelihood were few. Today this is different. The social stigma has gone or is going fast. The opportunity for a woman's obtaining work are increasing. The fear of social ostracism and the fear of hunger being removed, we can expect under our present marriage system that divorces will increase rather than decrease.

Once if a woman realized that she had made a great mistake she had little or no recourse. Today she knows that she has many open doors before her. I am not saying whether these things are good or bad. I am simply describing the situation. Personally I regret the increase of divorces, but I do not believe that making them harder to obtain is any solution of the problem. In fact I fear that it would increase the real problem that society faces.

The economic freedom of women has brought us face to face with a long series of questions about our moral codes. From this there is no escape. These questions arise in America, in the Western World, everywhere the throbbing machine age has loosed the shackles that bound women to the old order. Once the whole fabric of society held woman to a certain "rule of conduct." She was enmeshed in a perfect network of customs and traditions. The code of the moral law for her was ironclad. Church, state, and the social order all insisted that she obey. If she did not, there was for her no chance. She never could come back. Men and women united in affirming—if ye have entered there, for you there is no hope.

But today the bonds are broken. A new order of society is here. Woman once property of man, his servant; once dependent on man for all the necessaries of life now finds herself free. For her there is a new world, and she steps into it with an exhilarating sense of freedom.

It is only to be spiritually and morally blind if we fail to recognize what this means to all our social conventions. This thing could not happen without effecting a profound influence on our whole social life. The fabric that bound woman, the net that enmeshed her, these have been broken and torn apart.

Can we wonder if she looks upon this new world with eagerness. Can we be surprised if we are compelled to reorganize all our social thinking. The stock argument against woman suffrage was "woman's place is in the home." The fallacy of this contention lay in the fact that hundreds of thousands of women were engaged in industrial, social and professional work. This fact in itself made suffrage socially necessary. The new order meant new duties. It is this new order that compels us, whether we will or not, to face the fact that economic freedom has brought us a new outlook upon marriage on the part of women. And with this comes inevitably a challenge to our entire moral code.

Any period of transition is one of more or less chaos. The old order had a certain fixity, an established rigidity. The new order is in a state of flux. The new sanctions have only just appeared. People have established no fixed aims, no social conventions. It is a condition of rapid growth. This does not mean that we face catastrophe,—that the moral life is utterly disintegrating. It means the very opposite. Macaulay's parable of the men long confined in a dungeon coming out into the day and dazzled by the bright light applies to our present situation.

Many people think that our problems today, social and moral problems, are those pertaining to the younger generation. One would think to read some of the modern Jeremiahs that the younger generation came into the world and created the automobile, the movie, the radio, economic freedom, modern dress, and all the rest of it. The fact is that they were born into a world made for them. The social customs of today are set, not so much in our colleges and universities as in our country clubs. The youngsters follow their elders.

But the main point is that economic freedom for women between the ages of sixteen and thirty is changing all our attitudes toward life. And it especially has affected our attitude toward marriage and has even laid the basis for the acceptance of a new ideal of marriage relations. A woman economically has a chance not only to choose between the men who propose marriage but also between marriage and no marriage.

And if she decides for marriage, she will insist that it be on the basis of the recognition of her as an equal, not a subordinate. The intelligent woman must enter the marriage relation as a free soul, aware of her own worth and dignity. And if she ever seeks to be freed from the marriage bond she will insist that there may be even greater reasons than infidelity or physical cruelty that will impel her to do so.

"Not by judge or jury
Deciding evidence:
Not by frank acknowledgment of broken confidence:
Not by recognition of Priestly ban or bars:
But their souls' dissonance
Divergent as the stars."

Serious as all the problems that face individuals and society today this is not period of moral and spiritual decay. We are not witnessing all that we have revered and cherished in the moral ideals of humanity

sinking into a pit of abomination. We are at the beginning of a moral and spiritual rebirth. We are witnessing the arising of a new standard of morals based on a recognition of the unmeasurable value of human personalities. The "Thou shalt nots" are passing or have passed. In their place is arising a recognition of the worth and value of the person. It is upon this that the moral basis of the future generations shall rest. Here is a sanction for life and conduct that no higher critic can wash away. In this soil love, the highest expression of mutual trust and respect can grow.

If I had a daughter, I would thank God that she was born in this age rather than in any age that preceded it. I would rejoice that so many bars have broken down that shut out her forbears from the knowledge of life that she possesses. I would be glad that she could determine her destiny in larger measure than the women of any other period in the world's history.

We need not fear so long as humanity remains humanity, and men are men, and women are women, that economic freedom of women will disrupt our social fabric. On the contrary because it will afford the basis for the realization of the new ideal of marriage it will in the end strengthen all the social fabric that binds us in a social order.

For all that is enduring in society depends on the values inherent within the individuals that compose it, and anything that ennobles womanhood, must be an expression of the sense of worth in individual men and women.

Because economic freedom gives the opportunity to women we are all the gainers. Marriage itself will become more and more an enduring union of two souls bound together not by law or custom but by the inseverable ties of mutual esteem, respect and love. On this basis the society of the future will move on and on to afford fuller and richer life for all its members.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

It seems tragic indeed that Zionism should be called upon to meet another disaster. Yet here is Aimee Semple McPherson declaring in Jerusalem that Zionism is "wonderful," and has "thrilled" her beyond words!

We preached on H. L. Mencken some Sundays ago, and the soloist chose to sing Mrs. Beach's setting of Browning's

> "God's in his heaven,
> All's right with the world."

We think even Mr. Mencken would appreciate this!

A play recently produced in New York had only a single character. This was considered an amazing feat. But why amazing? In this age of "movies" and "talkies," one flesh-and-blood character upon the stage seems like a liberal provision of talent.

One learns how petty are most of the events which absorb our attention and occupy our thought when one journeys suddenly to an unfamiliar city, picks up the local newspaper, and fails to recognize a name or a fact in the head-lines that stream in two-inch letters across the front page.

Sea captains are declaring that the Gulf Stream is moving west, and prophesying that New York will soon have the climate of Florida. If this great change comes about, what excuse will our millionaires find for mid-winter vacations? Where will they go, and why?

The "wets" may have the right psychology. A wife who never stops talking, complaining, protesting, screaming, eventually wears out the patience of any husband. *But*—what does the husband do when his patience is gone? Does he give in to his nagging spouse, or does he kill her with an axe?

J. H. H.

Parables of War and Peace

VII

It All Depends!

"Yes," said the sergeant, as the members of the court-martial awaited the appearance of the prisoner, "that last shot of mine killed two men. It was curious—I saw those two Boches step out of the trench, only a few yards away. I hesitated a moment, for I knew they must have thought the armistice hour had come, and the fighting was over. But my watch said only four minutes to eleven, so I popped away and they were dead 'uns before you could say 'Jack Robinson.' I had to laugh! Poor devils, I guess they'll know next time that it's bad business being ahead of time."

A loud laugh from the group of officers was silenced almost before it began by the entrance of the prisoner, under heavy guard.

"Private Jones," said the colonel, after the usual preliminaries, "I am sorry to state you are charged

with the murder of one Mann, a private in the German army. You were seen to shoot the deceased at eleven-ten o'clock, on the morning of Monday, November 11th. What have you to say for yourself?"

"Nothin', sir, exceptin' that I thought that a Boche was to be killed on sight. I've been killin' 'em for the last ten months, sir, just as regular as I got a chance. I've been mentioned in the despatches twice, and named for a Distinguished Service Medal once, for killin' bunches of 'em together. I was only keepin' on doin' what I've been doin' ever since I come here to the front!"

"Private Jones, don't you know that the armistice went into effect, and that the fighting stopped at 11 A. M. sharp?"

"I know it now, sir, but I didn't know it then. I'd smashed me watch some days back—I was all alone on post duty. I thought it was funny that Heine should be showin' himself all careless like, and I wondered if the dirty business was over. But there seemed to be some firin' 'way off down the line, so I says to meself, 'Do what you've been told, me boy. Kill 'em, smash 'em, rip 'em up!' So I let go on the bloody cuss, and he tumbled over like an empty meal sack. It was then I seen the corporal comin' down the line, and tellin' me the war was done, thank God."

The colonel was whispering to the major. For some minutes there was quiet conference among the assembled officers. At last the colonel spoke.

"I'm sorry, Jones," he said, "but ignorance is no excuse. You killed your man, and are guilty, therefore, of murder. The penalty of your crime, under ordinary circumstances, of course, is death. But we feel that your record of service is not to be ignored, and recognize that there was no evil intent in your action. We have therefore agreed to pronounce you 'Guilty,' and to recommend that your sentence be commuted to ten years."

Private Jones was led away, and there was a moment's pause, before the appearance of the next prisoner.

"One of those two men of mine," said the sergeant, "the two I popped on the last day, was a captain. I saw the stripes on his arm as he fell. I'll get a decoration for that."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

American Notes

A Sunday in Northampton

I spent yesterday in Northampton, Massachusetts, suddenly drawn by a bulletin notice, mailed from there, announcing that at the morning service of the First Church a big new pulpit Bible would be "dedicated to Elder John Strong, the first elder of the First Church." I went up on the sleeper, which got me there at 6:30, and this, with the daylight-saving scheme beginning that morning, meant that I was on the ground, if not bright, at least early. (I am becoming suspicious that this daylight-saving idea originated in the brain of some Yankee, or Scotchman.)

I left my bag at the "Northampton," and took my customary oatmeal with cream, muffins and coffee. As I started out for a walk, I noted a "Calvin" movie-house. It occurred to me that the owner was playing with Yankee caution, for it might be named for the late President, or for John Calvin to whom the town owes as much for its place in the sun as Stratford-on-Avon does to Shakespeare. I had chosen the right day for my visit, for the birds were just beginning to sing, and the trees to bud after their winter's imprisonment, and the sunshine was radiant.

At the breakfast table, I was impressed by the electric-light bulb holders on the tables. They were empty bottles. On the bottles were the words (I wrote them down, not being willing to trust my memory) "Wilson's Scotch Whiskey, 28½ oz." These bottles were very decorative, would be tantalizing, I suppose, to some, but what could be more appropriate than an Edison bulb standing guard over a bottle, and light issuing from the empty vessel?

I noted down a few things I saw as I walked about from the Bridge Street Cemetery on one end to Smith College on the other. The Cemetery always seemed to be more a part of the life of the town than Smith College. Smith seems to be a kind of importation, and rather foreign at that. One could sit on one of the table-monuments in the Cemetery—that of Solomon Stoddard's, for example—and write one of the most brilliant stories of American life. Northampton was the brain and soul of western Massachusetts for one hundred and fifty years. The Connecticut Valley is where the West for a hundred years was before it began.

Some changes in Northampton! I found on Strong (!) Avenue a big church out of whose doors, early in the morning, people were thronging. It was "St. John the Divine." Polish were the people. Up near the "Old Whitney Homestead" I found another church, "The Church of the Sacred Heart." French. Found there were four hundred French parishes "not far from here." But the old First and the Edwards (latter badly named, for Jonathan Edwards belonged to the First—very confusing, as people think they are going to Jonathan Edwards's former church, whereas they are not) churches are on Main Street, at the top of which stands the College.

Don't forget to see the boulder-monument to Elder John in Bridge Street Cemetery. It is about two hundred feet from the Bridge Street entrance, to the right. It is a quartz boulder that was brought down from the hills. Weight, about two tons. Not high—about three and a half feet. A copper-plate—about fifteen by twenty inches—securely fastened to the boulder, bears the names of Elder John Strong, 1605-1699—Abigail Ford Strong, died 1684—Thomas Ford, died 1676. This boulder monument ought to stand for over a thousand years without repairs. Monument makers would not recommend this kind. But if people must have a monument, this kind is the kind to have—simple, endurable, inexpensive.

And now the service at the First Church, with the dedication of the Bible for pulpit use! If any of you ever speak or preach in the First Church, you will

find a big gilt-edged Oxford Bible, and on the cover in gold letters these words, "Dedicated to John Strong, the first Elder of the Church, 1661-1699, at the Massachusetts Bay Tercentenary Service, April 27, 1930."

The preacher for the service was Richard H. Clapp, of the United Church of New Haven. Appropriately, he is a descendant of Preserved Clapp, the second Ruling Elder of the Church. "The Service of Dedication of the Pulpit Bible in memory of Elder John Strong (1661-1699)" was written by Mr. Clapp himself, and I am including it here as printed in the Bulletin.

Here it is, beginning with Responsive Reading, Psalm 19, with the people standing:

Minister—In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, our fathers' God and ours,

People—We dedicate this book.

Minister—To the memory of John Strong, a good and useful man, representative of the stalwart pioneers who founded this community and established this Church,

People—We dedicate this book.

Minister—In grateful remembrance of our rich heritage of piety and devotion, in lives informed, disciplined and enriched by the word of God,

People—We dedicate this book.

Minister—For instruction and inspiration in things spiritual for ourselves and our children, for guidance in thought and worship, for wise interpretation of conduct, that the mind which was in Christ Jesus may become our mind, and His spirit possess us till for us to live is Christ,

People—We dedicate this book.

Minister—To the free mind and reverent spirit consecrated by the faith and sacrifice of the past and the obligation of the present, to the bringing in of the kingdom of God in Church and State and all the world,

People—We dedicate this book.

The address was a good one, and our family, along with some other hundreds of thousands descendants, ought to be grateful that a preacher from Yale should make a commendatory address on the three hundredth anniversary of the time when the ship, "Mary and John" was on the stormy Atlantic, bringing our forebears, who came with no return ticket to this land of winters and savages. He took the right text, "Hebrews," chapter 11, verse 27, and made three points as applying as well to the Puritans: "By faith (1) he forsook Egypt (2) not fearing the wrath of the king (3) for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible." The Puritan forsook England, not fearing the King, and walked by faith in God.

The preacher lauded the *essential* Puritan, not the Puritan with his faults. The Puritan had a moral orbit, along with a strong sense of fact. The Puritan first had mastery of himself, and out of this first conquest came the mastery of the world. He drove the horses of his passions. At his best he made no compromises, and did not allow any drift in his life. He steered his ship by the stars of God. And, in our modern world, with its multitudinous complexities, is there not a great need for the essential Puritan—men with moral orbits, with courage sustained by faith in the eternal, not fearing the "wrath of the king," willing to leave Egypt if conscience calls?

I rejoice that Elder John Strong (he was then about 25!) had sense and courage enough to leave England, and that he took the best there was in England—liberty and conscience—and worked these hard here. I am just as glad that my immediate ancestors —between me and Elder John—had the good judgment to leave Connecticut and Massachusetts over a century ago, and settle in the wilderness around Cleveland. The finest thing that I know is a pioneer spirit —to cross oceans and climb mountains unafraid.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Atheist Museum in Moscow

[From our Special Correspondent]

The Atheist Museum in Moscow is ironically enough housed in a monastery. This edifice as chance would have it is popularly known as the Red Monastery though its guidebook name is the Strasnoi Convent. It is the Red Monastery not because of Bolshevism or Revolution, but simply because of the rosy color of its bricks. It is not a particularly prepossessing group of buildings, the church and its cloisters with a neglected backyard full of gnarled old trees. A pre-war Baedeker mentions that a good view of Moscow may be had from the belfry. Apparently there were no treasures within. The backyard is open to the public nowadays and there are children practicing tree-climbing while mothers air their shabby babies.

In what was once the church vestibule we check our coats and galoshes as is required in every museum and theater in Russia. Coal is scarce and Russia poor and the museums are often ill-heated, but the rules of dictatorship are firm and you can't wear your coat even if you want to.

The Bolsheviks are clever propagandists. No one will ever deny that. They have set themselves to make all of Russia atheist, and this Museum plays its not unimportant part in a vast anti-God program which begins with babies and runs through nurseries, schools, clubs, theaters, motion pictures, literature, factories and farms, newspapers and practically every organization in Soviet Russia. In Leningrad the proud Cathedral of St. Isaacs, with its great gilded dome, its walls lined with many-colored marble and its columns of lapis lazuli, has met the same fate as the Red Monastery in Moscow. Its sacred wall paintings today look down upon exhibits which aim to destroy the faith of those who once worshipped in this fashionable and lavish church. In it are displayed 1,000 pairs of nails taken from the churches of 1,000 villages in the land where in each isolated town the separate pairs of spikes had been enshrined as the original nails that hanged Christ to the cross.

In the Red Monastery, torn from their religious trappings, is an enormous collection of the objects of superstition which have kept the Russian proletariat in mental darkness for so many years, as well as exhibits showing the close connection of the Orthodox Church and Czardom and the resultant abuses.

Our attention was first caught by a large number of collection cans and a plate filled with small coins, reminder of the support of the church by the ignorant, poverty-stricken masses. Eloquently near was hung a framed statement of a certain priest's bank account

—2,300 rubles for one year only. And his photograph lying on a soft feather bed! These are matched by lurid posters, one of which pictures the Czar with a sword in one hand and a cross in the other, while a priest stands nearby in the process of fixing to the back of a bent little peasant an enormous wooden cross. Another poster shows a worn old peasant driving a plow while a burly priest with a cross in one hand drives him on with a whip. Still another depicts a priest supplying a monastery with a woman which he carries on his back concealed in a sheaf of wheat. There is a frame full of Czarist decorations to the clergy bestowed for "quieting the population during a revolt, for stimulating the soldiers to fight, and for converting heathen and other Christians to the orthodox faith."

Charts on the wall describe the number of churches and shrines built yearly in Russia. Thus, between 500 and 600 churches and from 600 to 800 shrines were built every year between 1901 and 1914. A plain collection of statistics, but a picture arose before my eyes of the dozens of villages I had passed on the train, wretched little villages of squalid straw huts in a setting of mud, but always a shining white church with its gold turnip-dome towering disdainfully above them!

The silly superstitions initiated and encouraged by the clergy are here set forth in all their crassness and absurdity. There is a piece of a so-called sacred oak, for example, where some miracle or other was supposed to have happened. A whole forest of oaks would not have furnished the number of pieces which priests sold to ignorant peasants, who hoped to acquire some blessing therefrom.

Dreams were interpreted, not according to Freud, but by a method which to the ordinary skeptic has neither rhyme nor reason. There is a whole book of dreams exhibited in the Moscow Museum and a chart of pictures peddled to illiterate peasants who could thus interpret their own dreams by the visual education method. A dream of raw meat, for instance, indicated that the dreamer would be ill. (That his slumbers were already being disturbed by abdominal discomfort due to overeating or drinking, doubtless, had nothing to do with this magic.) A dream of a horse meant that some one was about to tell you a lie—beware! Dreaming of the devil, however, meant you were in love. At any rate, these forerunners of Freud had a sense of humor.

Several skeletons in the last stages of decay are exhibited in glass cases. These were erstwhile saints worshipped by the faithful. As we approached this ghastly array of bones our interpreter shuddered and covered her face. "I can't look at them," she said. "And the worst is to think that once I kissed things like that myself." Her conversion to atheism had been complete.

Another exhibit consists of instruments of torture, said to have been taken from monasteries where unbelievers were punished. Here is also shown the Roman Catholic Inquisition with models showing the pope and his court with the Swiss guards in the rotunda of St. Peters' looking on at the burning of the heretics.

Numerous ikons, holy pictures and water bottles are much in evidence. One of the most impressive pictures is that of the Czar Nicholas, whose features had been painted to resemble those of Jesus. To an illiterate peasant the holy Czar and the Christ were subtly united in one person. The Czar was God, and God was the Czar!

But the cleverest exhibits of all, and those of real artistic merit, are a half-dozen small theater models depicting typical scenes in the perverted religious life of Czarist Russia. The settings and lighting are beautifully done with that eye for detail for which the Russians are noted. One is in three scenes. The first part shows a man in a confession box with the priest listening to his words. In the second the priest is tattling the information he has gotten in the confession to a Czarist police official. The third shows the erstwhile confessor being flogged by the police official. Dramatic and effective. Another model shows a mob of revolutionists below in a square. In the church belfry is a Yunker with a machine-gun being urged on by two priests to mow down the protesting workers. Still another model pictures a convent of nuns with peasant women doing the hard labor for them.

Everywhere the propaganda indicates how the church was used as a tool for the military and acquisitive purposes of the state. There is a replica of a field-chapel used by the Czar on the field of battle. Ikons hung on cloth of gold, rich tapestries and a cannon on the altar! "God is with us," chanted the priests. In war times bishops had the rank of colonels, and priests were army officers. There is a vivid picture of the clergy leading the troops forward in the Turkish war. The mitres of the clergy tipped with imperial crowns showed the liaison between the state and church.

The Orthodox Church of Russia is not the only one assailed by Soviet propaganda. A section of the Museum is devoted to the Jewish faith and to Protestant sects. Tablets of the Jewish laws are exhibited as absurdities. There is a collection of presents given to the Czar as thank-offerings by rich Jews who had been spared when pogroms were visited upon their communities. In a case are exhibited samples of the literature of Seven-Day Adventists, Baptists and even Christian Scientists with defamatory labels suggesting either collusion with the Czar or as in the case of the Christian Scientists a plot of the foreign bourgeoisie to mislead the workers. Only the Society of Friends is not represented. Whether the propagandists omitted this sect because of their insignificant numbers or whether out of respect for their work in Soviet Russia it is impossible to say.

The final room in the Museum is devoted to a scientific exhibit of the development of religions from the very earliest forms of nature worship to present day forms. It is an admirable collection of objects from all over the world. Here are models of Greek, Roman, Chinese, Egyptian and Indian gods, of the old river and nature-gods still worshipped in certain parts of Russia and models of the sun-worshipping temples of old Mexico. There are many objects from the Roman Catholic Church, of ikons and holy objects from the Greek Church, and finally, an exhibit, complete in every detail, of the development of the human embryo. A final thrust of the propagandists—natural science confronting make-believe.

We were not the only ones in the Museum. Russian museums, I discovered, were always full. This Saturday afternoon, troops of school children were being taken through by teachers who stopped and

carefully explained the exhibits. One little girl halted admiringly before a plaster-cast of a Virgin with a sky-blue gown and golden hair. "Isn't she pretty?" the child murmured. She had hardly got the words out of her mouth before she must have realized that she had made a *faux pas*. "No," the teacher rebuked her, "that is not pretty." I watched this group as they stood before cases full of rich vestments gorgeously embroidered. Said the teacher, pointing to the clothes, "Were the priests poor?" "No," chorused the children. "Do we have clothes like that?" Again a chorus of "No."

Shabby, hatless youngsters in their thin cotton clothes—a contrast, indeed, to those costly church garments. Effective propaganda, that Museum!

DOROTHY WALTON.

The Banner of Peace

Humanity in divers ways is striving for peace, and everyone, in his own heart, realizes that this constructive work is a true prophecy of a new era. In view of this it is certainly incongruous to hear discussions on the comparative desirability of various bullets or on whether one type of ship is closer to the conception of world unity than the cannons of two battleships. Let us, however, consider these discussions as preliminary steps toward the same great peace that will tame the belligerent instincts of humanity by the resplendent and joyous creations of the spirit.

The fact remains, however, that the shells of even one of these cannons can destroy the greatest treasures of art and science as successfully as a whole fleet. We deplore the loss of the library of Louvain and the unreplaceable loveliness of the Cathedral of Rheims; we remember the beautiful treasures of private collections which perished during the world's misunderstandings. We do not, however, wish to inscribe above them words of enmity; let us simply say "Destroyed by human errors, and recreated by human hope." Nevertheless, errors in this or any other form may be repeated, and other precious milestones of human achievement can be destroyed.

Against such errors of ignorance we should take immediate measures, even though these may be only preliminary. But even in such measures of safeguarding, some very successful steps can be made. No one can deny that the flag of the Red Cross proved to be of immeasurable value and reminded the world of humanitarianism and compassion.

For this reason, a plan for an international Peace Pact which would protect all treasures of art and science through an International Flag has been outlined by the Roerich Museum for presentation through America to all foreign governments. The purpose of the project, which has been submitted to the State Department and the Committee on Foreign Relations, is to prevent the repetition of the atrocities of the last war on cathedrals, museums, libraries and other lasting memorials of creation of the past.

It is the plan of the project to create a flag which will be respected as International and Neutral Territory, this to be raised above museums, cathedrals, libraries, universities and any other cultural centers. The plan, projected by the Roerich Museum, was drawn up according to the codes of International Law by Dr. George Chklaver, Doctor of International Laws and of Political and Economical Sciences, Paris University, lecturer in the Institute of International High studies, in consultation with Professor Albert Geouffre de la Pradelle, member of the Hague Peace Court, Vice President of the Institute of International Law, of Paris, and member of the Faculty of Law, the Sorbonne. Both are Honorary Advisors of the Roerich Museum.

As set forth in Article I of the Pact, "Educational, artistic and scientific institutions, artistic and scientific missions, the personnel, the property and collections of such institutions and missions shall be deemed neutral and, as such, shall be protected and respected by belligerents.

"Protection and respect shall be due to the aforesaid institutions and missions in all places and subject to the sovereignty of the high contracting parties, without any discrimination as to the state allegiance of any particular institution or mission."

When the idea of an international cultural flag was first propounded, we were not surprised to find that it met with unanimous interest and enthusiasm. Experienced statesmen wondered why it had not been thought of before. When we asked our honorary advisors, Dr. George Chklaver and Professor Albert Geouffre de la Pradelle to frame this idea into an international formula, we received not only a splendidly formulated project of international agreement, but also many answers full of pan-human sympathy. This international flag for the protection of beauty and science would not in any way demean any interests or lead to misunderstandings. On the contrary, it elevates the universal understanding of evolutionary discoveries, as though new human values had been created and we were moving on to a path of progress and peace. And this understanding of a creative striving toward peace becomes more real. Above all else, this guardian of peace reminds one of the necessity for impressing cultural treasures in the world annals. This is not difficult and in many countries it is already accomplished, although there are gaps and each enrichment in the universal consciousness must be greeted. As the Red Cross flag needs no explanation to even the most uncultured mind, so does this new flag, guardian of cultural treasures, speaks for itself. It is simple enough to explain, even to a barbarian, the importance of safeguarding art and science.

We often repeat that the cornerstone of the future civilization rests upon beauty and knowledge. Now we must act upon this thought, and act quickly. The League of Nations, which has progressed toward international harmony, will not be opposed to this flag, for it expresses their aims of a world unity.

That the idea was originally conceived in the United States is not an accident. By its geographical position, the United States is least personally affected by such measures of protection. Hence, this proposition comes from a country whose own art treasures are in no particular danger, illustrating the better that

this flag is a symbol of peace, not of one country, but of civilization as a whole.

The flag designed for this project has three spheres within a circle on a white ground, symbol of eternity and unity. Although I do not know when this banner may wave above all the world's cultural institutions, the seed is already sown. Already it has attracted many great minds and travels from heart to heart, spreading once again peace and goodwill among men.

Really it is imperative to take immediate measures to preserve the noble heritage of our past for a glorious posterity. This can only come if all countries pledge themselves to protect the creations of culture, which after all belong to no one nation but to the world. In this way we may create the next vital step for a universal culture and peace. NICHOLAS ROERICH.

The W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Enforcement

There has been, we believe, a considerable and noticeable change in the attitude of temperance workers—as typified by the W. C. T. U. for example—since the passage of the Prohibition amendment in 1919. The emphasis in their arguments has been almost totally shifted and the spirit that underlies their present attitude has practically no relation, except a historical one, with their pre-1919 spirit.

We mean by this that before Prohibition was a national law, the W. C. T. U. and other temperance societies were crusading bodies, bent on educating the public to its view and teaching to the best of its ability what it believed to be solid facts, social, physiological, moral, or whatever you please, in an effort to dry the country up and to bring about a sufficient change in the electorate's opinions to put the power of the government behind its proposals. We mean—to put it simply and squarely—that temperance workers were propagandizing the public with the avowed belief that their platform was good for the nation and good for the individual.

In contrast to this we see the present-day attitude: a sort of determined harshness that the law shall be obeyed because it is the law; that the public shall know that prohibition and temperance are no longer matters of personal choice, but public duties; that there is now, and has been since 1919, no necessity for further education of the public; and that the responsibility for the enforcement of the law now lies with the powers that be and with the individual's conscience, not with the instilling, on the part of temperance workers, of a respect for law which *should* be inherent.

Before 1919 there was a goal to be reached: the enactment of a Constitutional amendment. Now, on the other hand, the protagonists of Prohibition know—as every sensible person knows—that the amendment, having been adopted, can never be changed by legislation. Accordingly, they make the fatal mistake of believing that their work is done, except so far as they can point the finger of scorn at their weaker brothers.

If a concrete example of this should be called for, we would suggest the enforcement fund raised by Governor Pinchot a few years ago by public subscription. If we remember correctly, this was used to supplement the regular budgetted amount coming from the public funds, and was donated by locals of the W. C. T. U., by churches and by individuals. The contrast is this: The money in this case was spent to enforce the law directly. If such a fund had been raised before 1919, there would have been no law to enforce—by enforcement we understand the use of the state's police power—and the money would accordingly have been spent on preachers, speakers, text-books, advertisements and the like. This, we believe, is a tangible bit of evidence of the change in attitude taken by prohibitionists.

This is not, of course, to say that there is no longer any crusader left in the ranks. Obviously, this is not so, for there are many distinguished and brilliant men leading that end of the fight. It is to say, however, that the great body of men and women are now only passively interested, and that their spirit has undergone a tremendous transformation.

The question now is: What of it? And our answer is—remembering that we have assumed from the beginning that Prohibition is justifiable morally and socially and that its enforcement is desirable—that unofficial bodies, like the W. C. T. U., would do far more good for the cause by getting back to their pre-1919 attitude than they will ever do by continuing to congratulate themselves on having saved the country. It is certainly plain enough to those of us who live in the eastern part of the United States that Prohibition is not being enforced strictly and that it probably never can be—except at a tremendous expense that is hardly justifiable so long as other methods remain untried—so long as the attitude of the body of people, even if it is only a militant minority, is as it is.

Our answer is that the duty of the temperance bodies is to get back into the fight where they left off in 1919—to continue what they were doing then with all the power they have—to use the most up-to-date methods of propaganda possible, and to reach the people in every conceivable way.

This may seem a bit drastic: "Propaganda" has acquired an ugly connotation since the war, and we now speak rather of "educating" the public. As a matter of fact, of course, propaganda—by which we understand the conscious attempt to cultivate a certain opinion in other people—is good or bad only as the motives underlying its use and the ends it serves in a given instance are good or bad. It is impossible to say once and for all that it shall not be used because it is undesirable. Even granting that we could agree that it were deplorable, it would still be futile to deplore it. The solution of this problem, then, must lie in only one direction: using it as "God has given us to see the right."

It must be perfectly evident, however, that what is chiefly meant when propaganda is being deplored and inveighed against are the modern methods: the new ways of exploiting the public, especially high-powered advertising, the radio and moving picture, and the like. We, apparently, have gotten to the point where we believe that all the methods used before, say 1914, are permissible, while those discovered during and after the war are beyond the pale of decency and, hence, may never be used by even a legitimate cause.

For us to think that way, however, is pure and

unadulterated foolishness. The very idea that we can ever unlearn what we have learned is nonsense. Only a perfect conspiracy of silence could keep the coming generations from knowing just how much we of the third decade of the twentieth century have discovered of the inner workings of men's minds. And such a conspiracy of silence is so unlikely of accomplishment—in fact, the only possibility of accomplishing it at all is for present methods to be superseded by more efficient ones—that we, as a purely protective measure, would have to put up with it. And, on the other hand, this again is similar to what we said before: Even these methods do not necessarily bear a tinge of darkness about them—their goodness or their badness lie simply in the motives underlying their use in a given instance. The moral problem is there, to be sure, but it does not lie in using or not using, but in using for good or for bad. When propagandizing becomes a profession and adopts an honest professional code of ethics—and may God hasten the day!—then we shall be quite sure that the twentieth century produced many foolish fears in its early decades.

There are only two conditions that propaganda, *per se,* must live up to: (1) that it shall be honest and shall not use lies or half-truths; and (2) that it shall be conducted openly and above-board.

The relevancy of all this to our main thesis must be apparent already: It is simply that the W. C. T. U., and other extra-legal agencies for enforcing Prohibition, should make the best of the present situation by making an almost complete *volte-face* in return to its pre-1919 program, that it should adopt the latest methods available and that it should hesitate not one instant to use them.

It is nonsense to say that Prohibition cannot be enforced. It is equally nonsense to say that it can be enforced as long as the present state of affairs continues. They are right, we believe, who condemn the present law on the ground that such a law as it is, evoking a considerable amount of public controversy, should be the crystallization of public opinion, and that it can never be enforced with a militant minority against it. The origin of laws in all likelihood lies in that direction. But the conclusion for us must be apparent: If we have enacted a law—which we believe to be good—against which there is much public resentment, it is not sufficient to sit back and point our fingers, saying, "Naughty, naughty, you're disobeying the law," but, on the contrary, we must do now what should have been done long ago: cultivate the soil by "educating" the people (to mix a metaphor or two) so that the seed which thus far has apparently fallen on rocky soil may still have a chance to grow and develop and respond to our efforts.

That seems to us to be the only attitude a liberal Prohibitionist can consistently take—and, if we may offer an apology, it seems to us to be justifiable, granting the premise which we have postulated from the beginning: that Prohibition is socially and morally desirable.

T. Richard Witmer.

The Study Table

Wall Street on Trial

In this imaginary trial* to determine the sanity of Wall Street the jury finds for the defendant. And this is an honest piece of work, for such is life. The financial system stays supreme despite the searing analysis of Mr. Floyd's prosecuting attorney, and well does the author know it. Today people who were crippled in the Crash still seize upon early editions of the papers to learn the opening prices.

Public utilities are in the headlines today. What better example of dividend greed? Mr. Floyd takes us into that cold, tight-lipped land where valuations are inflated so that rates are increased in order to pay a legally fair return on stockholders' money. The valuation exceeds the investment; necessarily the dividends are fatter than they should be—and our monthly bills are terrifying.

We pay interest to holding companies. A holding company is a parasitic growth in more ways than one: it saps the consumer's money and contributes nothing to business life. No product is improved, no distribution speeded, no economies effected by holding companies; cut them off, and industry goes on. But remain they do, sucking in their dividends.

You have heard of the Fourteenth Amendment, which protects life, liberty, and property. If your public service commission does not boost rates, the utility trots into court complaining that present rates are confiscatory, depriving it of property. The Constitution is violated.

The profit motive is the *leit motif* of this book. It is that powerful, unstoppable force which knows no decency; tramples humanity. On every page you find a shameless acknowledgement from the financial guardians of big business who are called as witnesses. In fact, the jury thinks the plaintiff is crazy for bringing suit.

On page 52:

"Q. Suppose a period of depression comes, which will you cut first, dividends or pay rolls?"

"A. The first duty of a corporation is to pay dividends, even if it has to reduce wages and lay off men.

"Q. Is it not indicative of Wall Street's madness that the people interested in the business, those who do no work, receive their dividends regularly, while those dependent for their very existence upon their day's work and who are anxious to serve the company by their labor, are deprived of their living on a day's notice?

"A. No one works harder than the officers of corporations."

On page 117:

"Q. Then you do not consider Wall Street guilty of money-mania when it proclaims that Capital is entitled to unlimited returns, while Labor should be satisfied with whatever Capital chooses to pay?

"A. Wall Street is perfectly sane in following natural laws."

To Mr. Floyd it seems that the one "law" followed on the Street is the Biblical assurance: *To him that hath shall be given.*

He has brought a new literary form to bear upon an ancient evil. By Q's and A's he dramatizes the

*"People vs. Wall Street," by William Floyd. Published by the Vanguard Press, New York. $2.50.

struggle between logic and greed. The sprightly part of it is the use of real names, Big Names—Morgan, Lamont, Schwab, Ford, Cortelyou, and more—from whom direct quotations are taken. After an answer like, "Any increase in wages that goes to employees greatly curtails profits," you look to the footnote and read: "Roger W. Babson." There you have the impish humor underlying Mr. Floyd's gravity, at once recognizable by his friends.

He has provided a catechism. Use it on your hecklers. But if you abstain from contentious conversation, donate the volume to the unconvinced.

For myself, I feel that the financiers are too strong to be fought. There is no use in butting a Stone Wall Street. Some day it will crumble. The lesson I derive is a philosophy of inward reliance—more faith in one's ideals and non-participation in the profit hunt—while the potbellied gorge.

ALFRED LIEF.

Book Notes

War! Behind the Smoke Screen.[1]

The author has traveled widely and read considerably; but it is past belief that anyone would now write a book on any type of opposition to war without mention of Outlawry or the Peace Pact.

1. War! Behind the Smoke Screen. By William C. Allen. John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia.

Evangelized America.[2]

A vivid story of the religious revival in America from the days of Jonathan Edwards' conception of "Sinners in the hands of an angry God" to the business efficiency of Billy Sunday and Aimee Semple McPherson. The author has a genuine understanding of the personal and social awakening that constitutes the reality underlying the emotional and theological froth of evangelism.

2. Evangelized Amercia. By Grover C. Loud. The Dial Press, New York.

Moral Adventure.[3]

A broad-minded conception of the moral implications of the teachings of Jesus, with special reference to sex.

3. Moral Adventure. By Burnett Hillman Streeter. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Days in An Indian Monastery.[4]

A sympathetic story of the intimate contacts of a devout American soul with the members of an Indian Monastery, under the leadership of Swami Paramananda.

4. Days in an Indian Monastery. By Sister Devamata. Ananda—Ashrama, La Crescenta, Calif.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Correspondence

Justice in Canada

Editor of UNITY:

I desire to bring to the attention of your readers an instance of justice as it is dispensed in the Province of Ontario. In glaring contrast to so many of the wholly ambiguous decisions usually handed down by the Higher Courts in the United States, is the judgment recently rendered by Sir Wm. Mulock of the Supreme Courts of Ontario. The case is one which aroused much interest throughout this province.

On February 28th last, a mob of disguised Klansmen sought to prevent a case of miscegenation, for which an Ontario license had been previously obtained. They induced a girl, who is white, to leave the house of her betrothed, who was presumed to be negro, but has since turned out to be pure Indian. Three members of the group, who had been recognized, were arrested and brought before the magistrate's court. Two of them, because of the technicality of being unmasked at the time they were apprehended, were dismissed. The third, Mr. Wm. A. Phillips, a chiropractor of Hamilton, Ontario, was fined fifty dollars. With usual Klan effrontery, this sentence was appealed in the Higher Courts, and brought forth the clear-cut and unequivocal decision which follows:

"There is no substantial dispute as to what are the facts in this case. A mob of men appeared at the residence of Mrs. Sault. Among the occupants of this house was a girl named Jones. One of the mob . . . requested the girl to come to a car in front of the house. She complied. She saw the mob and being requested to get into the car, she did so. No physical force was used, but . . . she acquiesced because of being intimidated by the large body of men, some fifty or seventy-five . . . disguised with hoods extending from the top of the head to the knees. . . . These facts show illegal interference with her liberty. The motive of the accused and his companions is immaterial. The accused and his companions took it into their own hands to interfere with her rights. In doing so, they not only committed an illegal offense as regards to her, but also a crime against the majesty of the law. . . . It (the law) is the supreme dominant authority controlling the conduct of everyone, and no person, however exalted or high his power, is entitled to do with impunity what that lawless mob did. The attack of the accused and his companions upon the rights of this girl was an attempt to overthrow the law of the land, and in its place to set up mob law, lynch law, to substitute lawlessness for law enforcement which obtains in civilized countries. . . . Mob law such as is disclosed in this case is a step in that direction, and, like a venomous serpent, whenever its horrid head appears, must be killed, not merely scotched. . . . We are therefore of the opinion that the monetary fine imposed by the magistrate was a wholly inadequate punishment, a travesty of justice, and we substitute therefor imprisonment for the term of three months. This being the first case of this nature that has come before the court, we have dealt with the offense with great leniency and the sentence here imposed is not to be regarded as a precedent in the event of a repetition of such an offense."

Feeling that this forthright decision might serve as an example for our own United States courts to emulate, I have taken the liberty of writing to you.

(Rabbi) MAURICE N. EISENDRATH.

Toronto, Canada

Marriage and Economics

Editor of UNITY:

Regarding "Bertrand Russell and Some New Ideas of Marriage," by John Haynes Holmes: If we take monogamous sexual relationship as the normal kind for human beings, then we need to learn why present civilization causes humans to desire to live otherwise. If we had a civilization fitting their real natures—biologically speaking—then though there were no legal restrictions monogamy would be the rule as a mere matter of course. As to people being spiteful and jealous, whether in sex or non-sex matters, that is due to the unnatural elements in present civilization. The root cause of harmful manifestations of human tendencies is the custom of putting a price on what is not human work, thus forcing some to work for others without being worked for as long in return—that custom is enough to produce disharmony between persons whether of the same or different sex. Truly ideal natural marriage will become possible to practically all after economic equal freedom for sane adults is attained; but hardly before that.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection

President Hoover's engineering training distinguishes his experiences from those which have marked the succession of chief executives of the United States. In common with others of our great presidents he is also deeply concerned with the welfare of children. It is as an engineer that he is primarily interested in the conservation of national resources, and he combined this scientific instinct with his consistent interest in the cause of children by calling, last July, the first meeting of the Planning Committee of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection.

The President has stated his belief that our success as a nation depends upon the success of our individual citizens, and that the foundation for fullest citizenship is sound health of mind and body for everyone. Characteristically he strikes at the roots of the problem in considering the nation's children.

The White House Conference comes as the consummation of the interest in children which President Hoover has had for many years, an interest manifested by his achievements in Europe, by his conspicuous work as Secretary of Commerce, when he stressed the fact that the producing strength of the nation depends upon the health of the people, by his administration of the American Child Health Association, and by his support of May Day—National Child Health Day.

The Conference has been divided by the Planning Committee into five sections, each subject to be studied in its relation to children's health and success: Medical Service, Public Health Service and Administration, Education and Training, The Handicapped Child (Prevention, Maintenance, Protection), and Public Relations. Its purpose is to gather all available information and scientific knowledge over the broadest possible field of child health and protection. Extensive research is not a part of the present activities of the Conference, it is stated, but where obvious gaps are present in the gathered information, programs of research may be suggested.

Secretary Ray Lyman Wilbur of the Department of the Interior is chairman of the Conference, and Dr. Harry E. Barnard of Indianapolis is its director. The personnel of its sections has been chosen from the leaders of the nation in child welfare, and its great number of committees is arranged with such scope that every branch of scientific knowledge regarding children and their care may be reported.

The purpose of the White House Conference, as announced, is: to study the present status of the health and well-being of the children of the United States; to report what is being done for child health and protection; to recommend what ought to be done and how to do it.

Beside Dr. Wilbur and Dr. Barnard, the officers of the Conference are Secretary of Labor James J. Davis, vice-chairman, and Edgar Rickard, of New York, treasurer. Miss Grace Abbott, of the Children's Bureau, Washington, is secretary of the executive committee.

The Medical Service Section, which will gather facts about the physical background and probable physical future of the child, is headed by Dr. Samuel McC. Hamill, M. D., noted pediatrist of Philadelphia. His associates are Kenneth D. Blackfan, M. D., Boston; Fred L. Adair, M. D., Chicago; Philip Van Ingen, M. D., New York.

Surgeon General Hugh S. Cumming directs the section on Public Health, which will investigate community measures for child health and protection. He will be assisted by E. L. Bishop, M. D., Nashville; George H. Bigelow, M. D., Boston; H. A. Whittaker, Minneapolis.

The Education and Training Section is headed by President F. J. Kelly of the University of Idaho. Associated with him are Louise Stanley, Ph. D., Washington; John E. Anderson, Ph. D., Minneapolis; Thomas D. Wood, M. D., New York; Anne S. Davis, Chicago; Henry Breckinridge, New York; Charles S. Berry, Ph. D., Ann Arbor, Michigan. They will study not only the child's school training, but the social, recreational and vocational fulfillment of his best talents.

C. C. Carstens, director of the Child Welfare League of America, heads the section which will consider the Handicapped Child. His associates are Mrs. Kate Burr Johnson, formerly of Raleigh, N. C., now of Trenton, N. J.; William J. Ellis, Trenton; Homer Folks, New York; Judge Frederick P. Cabot, Boston.

French Strother of Washington is chairman of the Public Relations Section, and Mrs. Aida de Acosta Breckinridge of New York is director.

More than seven hundred experts are serving on committees of the White House Conference, which insures a thorough study of the entire field of child problems. It is probable that a second full meeting may be called in November of this year, for presentation of findings ready at that time.

Three Years of Preparation
for Chicago's Second
Parliament of Religions
a possible part of the
Chicago World's Fair Centennial
Celebration or Century of
Progress, 1933
Chicago's
Fellowship of Faiths
Incorporated as "The Threefold
Movement—
Fellowship of Faiths
League of Neighbors
Union of East and West"
I. Fellowship of Faiths
(Founded 1924; for Religious Unity).
(1) To present Fellowship of Faiths **Programs** (with speakers and music

---

Needed, A New Conception of Deity

Editor of UNITY: Brother Joseph McAfee wanted the discussion continued on "Why the Church."

I do not want to discuss the question suggested in UNITY by Mr. McAfee on "Why the Church" but would like to offer a few thoughts. He said, "There had been no constructive program offered." It is not a new program that we need at present but a new conception of the Deity.

The church teaches that He is an angry God. Dr. Amos Wells said, "We talk so much about the love of God we forget that He is terrible to the disobedient." Christ told us of a loving God. It was the lost sheep, the disobedient one, that the good shepherd went to seek. We see Christ weeping over Jerusalem, longing to gather its people in his arms, yet knowing full well they thirsted for his blood. No, he is not an angry God, but a broken-hearted God.

The church teaches of a God that could not forgive until some atonement or sacrifice had been made.—"Arise my soul, shake off thy guilty fears," "The bleeding sacrifice in my behalf appears,"—Christ told us of a forgiving God. He told us "to forgive our enemies," that we might be called the children of our Father. He told us the story of the prodigal, how the Father ran to meet him and embraced him and kissed him. We see him hanging on the cross and with his last breath saying, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do," even when they were making sport of him. Man is never so God-like as when he forgives.

The teaching of the church makes of God two persons, one the Judge, the other a Mediator or Intercessor. "He ever lives above for me to intercede." "Before the throne my surety stands." Christ said "the Father and I are one." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

The church makes the death of Christ and the cross its central theme. "In the cross of Christ I glory." "He died that we might be forgiven."

Christ put the emphasis on his life and teaching, "I am the way, follow me." "He that doeth the will of my Father the same is my brother and sister." "He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." "Why do you call me Lord, Lord and do not the things I say?"

I have only indicated a few lines of thought. When we clearly see that God and Christ are really one, we have a different conception of God. We have a different conception of Christ and his mission. We have a higher opinion of ourselves. We have more love and sympathy for our fellow man, and life takes on a new and larger meaning.

JOHN T. RICKETT.

Howell, Mich.

representing several Faiths) in Churches, Clubs, Forums and other established meeting places.

(2) To promote Fellowship of Faiths **Committees** or **Groups** in Churches, Schools, Clubs and other independent organizations—and to help them to acquaint themselves with unfamiliar faiths.

(3) To Present Great **Fellowships of Faiths,** Throughout Chicago—and in Neighboring Communities.

Buddhist, Christian, Confucian, Hindu, Jew, Mohammedan Faiths are usually represented at each meeting—by inspiring speakers. (Other faiths, also, are sometimes presented.)

Moslem, Hindu, Jewish, Christian and other **Chants, Hymns, Music, Readings, Prayers** at each meeting. (We supply Booklets containing these.)

Such **Searching Themes,** for example, as the following, are discussed:

"Peace and Brotherhood as Taught by Buddhist, Christian, Confucian, Hindu, Jew, Mohammedan."

"What would Buddha, Confucius, Gandhi, Jesus, Mohammed, Moses—Say to Chicago?" (What manner of present day, city life does my faith teach?)

"Tributes to the Founders of Great Religions by Followers of Other Faiths." (Appreciation of Jesus by a Jew, of Moses by a Christian, et cetera.)

"Arab—Jew—Christian, in Palestine and Chicago."
(Appreciation of Jewish Neighbors in Palestine by an Arab from Jerusalem; Appreciation of Arab Neighbors by a Palestinian Jew; Appreciation of Jewish Neighbors in Chicago by a Christian—and of Christian Neighbors by a Jew.)

"How May Man **Use** God to Meet Man's Needs?"
(What does my faith show to be the sources and methods of personal power?)

"Tributes of Appreciation to—
Jewish Youth, Protestant Youth, Mormon Youth, Oriental Youth, Roman Catholic Youth, Negro Youth.
(What kind of new world are our younger generations creating?)

"Uniformity or Fellowship?—Which Does My Faith Seek as a Basis for World Unity?" . (Should Christianity, for example, strive to dominate or to appreciate other faiths?)

"'The Kingdom' (The Democracy) 'of God'—When, Where and How Does My Faith Envision It?"
(What must I, a Chicagoan, do to save and to be saved?)

II. League of Neighbors

(Founded 1920; For Racial Unity.)

(1) **Racial Groups**—through Characteristic Music, Songs, Folk Dances, Exhibits, and other activities, in native costumes,—to interpret to Chicago the ideals and customs, "the Loyalty, Art and Labor," which they contribute to the common life.

(2) Many **Leagues of Neighbors,** in many private family homes and other meeting places, to be helped "to Build Bridges of Understanding across the Chasms of Prejudice."

III. Union of East and West

(Founded 1910; for Cultural Unity)

(1) "A New Theatre" presenting Interpretative Cultural and Religious **Plays**—to give Chicagoans a true feeling for the culture and convictions of unfamiliar peoples.

(2) Such classics, for example, as "Sakuntala" (said to be one of the world's five greatest plays; written, many centuries ago, by Kalidasa "The Shakespeare of India") to be presented by good actors—competent and inspired to portray the living culture of India.

(3) Professional and amateur actors, producers, and other individuals, groups and organizations interested in the Drama, to be asked to help inspire Chicago, her suburbs, and neighboring cities throughout the Central West.

Fellowship of Faiths
American Central Western Headquarters—Chicago
City Hall Square Building, 139 N. Clark Street, Room 320
(Telephone CENtral 5169)

Australian Amazed at Prohibition in United States

Arnold J. Thomas, a prominent business man of Australia, on his first visit to America, has been making a study of Prohibition conditions. He told Charles R. Jones, Chairman of the American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation, whose headquarters he visited, that he was amazed at the Prohibition situation in the United States as compared to his native land.

Mr. Thomas comes from a country where they are battling to be "dry" to a country where a battle is being waged to make it "wet."

"From the hour of my arrival in Seattle, I have spent considerable time in the large western cities, including San Francisco, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City and Denver, studying evidences of liquor drinking and selling in hotels, restaurants, stores and shops to discover to what extent drinking men were in evidence in the centers of population," he said. "Since landing in America I have seen only one man noticeably under the influence of liquor and that was in San Francisco.

"The most startling impression on me was the complete absence of liquor advertising, liquor displays and open saloons, which we have in such abundance in all the principal cities of Australia. I had expected to find liquor solicitations on every hand through bell-hops and waiters, subtle and sly, of course, but I did not come upon a single instance of attempts to bootleg liquor to me, not even in Chicago, about which I had heard such terrible things. Evidences of prosperity and happiness appeared universally wherever I have been. Your total absence of 'slums' in the sense we know them in Australia was very significant.

"In Australia we are still passing through the throes of a desperate conflict with a completely legalized liquor traffic, entrenched in business, industry and politics, and wielding extraordinary power and influence, backed by gigantic funds, which have been piled up from the pockets of its victims.

"We are fighting on for freedom in Australia. No matter how poorly you may think your national Prohibition is being administered in America, I can assure you that your achievement is a wonderful realization of progress. The advertising of the 'wets' in Australia conveys to their readers the most unfair testimony regarding your national Prohibition experiment. This I have found out through my personal investigation and observation while in America."

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

MAY
Is the month for the year's greatest cleaning. The home's cold weather drapes and rugs, blankets and comforters, heavy motor robes, should all be cleansed before putting them away. Summer cretonnes and slip covers should be made ready for service. Send work here in confidence of its being done by the latest equipment and methods.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue